

Appl. No. 09/818,062
Amdt. dated 03/28/2006
Reply to Office action of 11/30/2005

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appl. No.	:	09/818,062	Confirmation No. 9158
Applicant	:	Sriram Haridas	
Filed	:	03/26/2001	
TC/A.U.	:	2157	
Examiner	:	SALL, EL HADJI MALICK	
Docket No.	:	81862.P214	
Customer No.	:	8791	

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria VA 22313-1450

AMENDMENT

Sir:

In response to the Office Action of 11/30/2005, please consider the following Remarks. No claims are amended.

Remarks/Arguments begin on page 2 of this paper.

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed 11/30/2005. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Reconsideration in light of the amendments and remarks made herein is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

3. The Examiner rejects claims 26-50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (US 6,959,072) in view of Isaka (US 6,654,455).

As to claims 26, 31, 36, 41, and 46, the Examiner asserts that Lee teaches a method for performing voice multicasting that includes generating a voice packet that includes a digital signal processing (DSP) mask field citing column 3, lines 30-36. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The cited portion of Lee discloses an internet gateway having a digital signal processor (DSP) which interfaces with the internet. This does not disclose generating a voice packet nor a voice packet including a digital signal processing (DSP) mask field as claimed. The mere presence of a DSP discloses nothing about mechanisms for using the DSP such as the claimed DSP mask field. The DSP disclosed by Lee is table driven which is entirely unlike the voice packet driven DSP of the claimed invention.

The Examiner admits that Lee fails to teach explicitly multicasting the voice data on the plurality of ports as selected by the DSP mask field. The Examiner asserts however, Isaka teaches multicasting using multicast router (figure 5, item 70; column 2, lines 1-10). Applicant respectfully disagrees. The cited portion of Isaka discloses a multicast router 70 that may be substituted for a conference trunk for managing a multicast group. In great contrast to the claimed invention, Isaka teaches a method where a multicast IP address is registered for a

conference connection. The network recognizes that particular telephones belong to the multicast group designated by the multicast IP address by reference to IGMP report packets. Thus the network forwards voice packets to the particular telephones that belong to the multicast group by recognizing the multicast IP address assigned to a packet as one previously memorized to designate the particular telephones. Col. 8, lines 28-55. This is entirely unlike the claimed invention that provides a DSP mask field in the voice packet that selects the ports on a line card on which the voice data that is stored in a memory rather than in the packet should be multicast. Thus neither Isaka nor Lee disclose generating a voice packet that includes a digital signal processing (DSP) mask field nor multicasting the voice data on the plurality of ports as selected by the DSP mask field as claimed. Lee and Isaka fail to disclose all claim limitations.

Lee discloses an apparatus and method for recording and reproducing voice messages that is delivered to a calling subscriber (Abstract). Isaka discloses an IP telephone conference system (Abstract). Lee delivers a recorded message to a caller and therefore lacks the requisite plurality of connected telephones to use the techniques of a telephone conferencing system. Therefore there is no motivation to apply techniques for telephone conferencing of Isaka to the techniques for delivery of a recorded message to a calling subscriber of Lee.

Lee is a "pull" system that determines which DSP port to use by reference to a DSP table and which message to be announced based on the event corresponding to the seizure of the office line by reference to a call processing table (col. 6, lines 50-67). There would be no reasonable expectation of success in the combination of Lee and Isaka because Lee does not provide for routing of a voice packet by an IP address and thus Lee does not disclose a place where the multicast IP address of Isaka could be used to combine the two disclosures.

As to claims 27, 32, 37, 42, and 47, the Examiner asserts that Lee teaches the DSP mask field comprising a bit field map having a plurality of bits in which each one of the plurality of bits selects one of the corresponding plurality of ports (column 2, lines 44-59). The Examiner argues that Lee discloses plurality of ports and determining which DSP port is available, and outputting the port information and the number of the corresponding voice message. The Examiner argues that, by definition, a digital signal processing unit includes a plurality of bit group digital signal processors for receiving the plurality of bit groups (figure 3A). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Figure 3A shows a DSP table including DSP identity, port corresponding to the DSP, and state of the port as enable, busy, or fault (col. 5, lines 21-28). Nothing in Lee discloses a bit field map having a plurality of bits in which each one of the plurality of bits selects one of the corresponding plurality of ports as claimed.

As to claims 28, 33, 38, 43, and 48, applicant relies on the patentability of the claims from which these claims depend to traverse the rejection without prejudice to any further basis for patentability of these claims based on the additional elements recited.

As to claims 29, 34, 39, 44, and 49, the Examiner asserts that Lee teaches that multicasting the voice data is without duplicating packets (column 3, lines 51-53; column 2, lines 10-14). Applicant respectfully submits that Lee does not teach multicasting as the Examiner admitted in the discussion claim 26.

As to claims 30, 35, 40, 45, and 50, applicant relies on the patentability of the claims from which these claims depend to traverse the rejection without prejudice to any further basis for patentability of these claims based on the additional elements recited.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 26-50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Isaka.

Conclusion

Applicant reserves all rights with respect to the applicability of the doctrine of equivalents.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

/James Henry/

Dated: 03/28/2006

By _____
James Henry
Reg. No. 41,064
Tel.: (714) 557-3800 (Pacific Coast)